

## REMARKS

Claims 1-4 are currently pending in the present application.

### Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-2 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Connery et al.* (US 6,311,276) in view of *Angelo et al.* (US 6,418,533). Applicants respectfully traverse such rejection.

Claim 1 recites "a control means ... for issuing a request to said portable client computer system via said wireless connection to disable said portable client computer system." On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the claimed control means is disclosed by *Connery* in col. 1, lines 28-30 and col. 6, lines 40-43. Col. 1, lines 28-30 of *Connery* states that the "Wake On LAN feature of network adapter cards in personal computers allows network administrators to remotely boot powered off end systems." In other words, *Connery* teaches that the Wake On LAN feature allows a personal computer system that has been powered off to be turned on remotely. Such teaching is contrary to the claimed control means that is intended to "disable said portable client computer system." Col. 6, lines 40-43 of *Connery* states that the "Wake On LAN is a feature of network adapter cards that allows network administrators to remotely boot powered off end systems." Here, *Connery* teaches that the Wake On LAN is a feature of a network adapter card for allowing a personal computer system that has been powered off to be turned on remotely. Again, such teaching is contrary to the claimed control means that is intended to "disable said portable client computer system."

In addition, Claim 1 recites "a network adapter ... for disabling said portable client computer system from further operations in response to said request." On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts the claimed network adapter is disclosed by *Connery* in col. 1, lines 28-30. As mentioned above, in col. 1, lines 28-30, *Connery* teaches that the Wake On LAN feature allows a powered-off personal computer system to be turned on remotely, which is contrary to the claimed control means intended to "disable said portable client computer system."

Because *Connery* does not teach or suggest the novel features of the claimed invention, and neither does *Angelo*, the § 103 rejection is believed to be overcome.

### CONCLUSION

Claims 1-4 are currently pending in the present application. For the reasons stated above, Applicants believe that independent Claim 1 along with its dependent claims are in condition for allowance. The remaining prior art cited by the Examiner but not relied upon has been reviewed and is not believed to show or suggest the claimed invention.

No fee or extension of time is believed to be necessary; however, in the event that any fee or extension of time is required for the prosecution of this application, please charge it against Deposit Account No. **50-0563**.

Respectfully submitted,



Antony P. Ng  
*Registration No. 43,427*  
BRACEWELL & PATTERSON, LLP  
P.O. Box 969  
Austin, Texas 78767-0969  
(512) 472-7800

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS